

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Applicant gratefully acknowledges Examiner's indication that claim 4 comprises allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim rejections and objections based on the above amendments and following remarks.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claims 1-15 were objected to for the reasons set forth on pages 2-4 of the Office Action. Applicants believe that each of the claim objections have been addressed by the above claim amendments. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for reasons set forth on pages 4-6 of the Office Action. Applicants believe that each of the claim rejections have been addressed by the above claim amendments. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 5 as being indefinite. In particular, Applicants contend that claims 4 and 5 are not conflicting. Claim 5 essentially recites that the "transition signals" that are output are the corresponding ones of the "transition accumulation signals". This is not conflicting, but merely limiting the nature of the transition accumulation signals. Support for this subject matter is clearly explained with regard to FIG. 4 and accompanying text. Namely, the transition signal is output as the transition accumulation signal when the transition signal has been accumulated a certain number of times. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Eglit (U.S. Patent No. 6,272,193) in view of Lippman (U.S. Patent No. 3,946,379). Claims 10-13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 and 21 as being unpatentable over Eglit. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the claim rejections,

independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 21 have been amended to include subject matter similar to that of claim 4, which Examiner has indicated is not disclosed or rendered obvious by the cited art of record.


For instance, claim 1 has been amended to recite *wherein the transition accumulator comprises a reset signal generator for performing a logic combination of the M transition accumulation signals and generating an accumulation reset signal for resetting the transition accumulator in response to the logic combination result*. Furthermore, claims 10, 16 and 21 have been amended to recite *performing a logic combination of the M transition accumulation signals and generating an accumulation reset signal for resetting the accumulating process in response to the logic combination result*. This subject matter is similar to that of claim 4.

Accordingly, claims 1, 10, 16 and 21 are believed to be patentable and non-obvious over the cited art of record for at least the reasons indicated on page 12 of the Office Action.

Moreover, the pending dependent claims are believed to be patentable and non-obvious over the cited art of record at least by virtue of their dependence from respective base claims 1, 10 and 16.

Therefore, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Frank V. DeRosa  
Reg. No. 43,584

F. Chau & Associates, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889